

## REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending in the current application. Applicants have amended claims 1, 4, 10, 15 and 20, and canceled claim 2. Support for the amendments is found, for example, from Page 13, Paragraph 2 of the specification and Figures 3 and 4 of the drawings. No new matter has been introduced by way of the amendments.

At the onset, Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for indicating that claim 10 contain allowable subject matter and would be allowable if rewritten in an independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. However, since the Applicants believe that all of the claims are allowable over the cited prior art based upon the amendments to the claims and the following analysis, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider the present application in light of the present response.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-4, 7-9, 11-15 and 18-20 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 7,095,457 to Chou (hereinafter “Chou”). Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection is overcome in light of the amendments to the claims and the following remarks.

To maintain a claim rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102, a prior art reference must disclose each and every element of the claim. Chou does not do so.

Applicants’ independent claim 1 recites a backlight unit including a chassis having a bay, a light emitting structure placed within the bay, and a bracket for quick installation and removal of the light emitting structure through the aperture to and from the bay. The chassis further includes wall means defining the bay, an aperture opening to the bay, and an optical panel that includes at least one light management feature. The light emitting structure includes at least one linear light source and a power control circuit coupled to the linear light source. The bracket

includes a support structure carrying the light emitting structure. The support structure includes a frame for supporting the linear light source, and a circuit mount having two portions for supporting the power control circuit. Significantly, the bay includes a first region for receiving the frame and two second regions for receiving the two portions of the circuit mount, respectively. Applicants' other independent claims 15 and 20 also recite a bay including a first region for receiving the frame and two second regions for receiving the two portions of the circuit mount, respectively.

Turning to the prior art, as illustrated in Figure 2, Chou discloses a detachable backlight module including a casing (10) with an opening (13), a detachable lamp rack (30) having a plurality of illumination units (31) and voltage transforming units (32), and a main circuit board (40) disposed behind the rack (30) and coupled to the units (31, 32). The casing (10) includes a guiding groove (11) on both sides of the opening (13), for drawing the detachable lamp rack (30) out along the guiding groove (see, Col. 3, Lines 3-7 of Chou). Specifically, the illumination units (31) and voltage transforming units (32) are disposed at the front and rear side of the rack (30), respectively. Thus, when the detachable rack (30) is inserted into the casing (10) along the guiding groove (11), the illumination units (31) and the voltage transforming units (32) are located at the same region within the casing. Thus, there is no differentiation of regions within the casing (10) for receiving the illumination units (31) and the voltage transforming units (32), respectively. Accordingly, Chou does not disclose "a first region for receiving the frame of the support structure and two second regions for receiving the two portions of the circuit mount of the support structure, respectively", as recited by claims 1, 15 and 20.

Thus, Chou fails to disclose each and every element of claims 1, 15 and 20, from which all the other claims ultimately depend. Accordingly, the rejection of claims 1-4, 7-9, 11-15 and 18-20 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) based on Chou is overcome, and withdrawal thereof is

respectfully requested.

The Examiner has rejected claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Chou in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,445,373 to Yamamoto (hereinafter “Yamamoto”). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1, from which claim 5 depends, is discussed above. Chou is discussed above relative to claim 1.

Yamamoto is relied on to allegedly teach two frame halves as being identical. Yamamoto does not remedy the underlying deficiencies of Chou relative to claim 1. Thus, neither Chou nor Yamamoto, taken alone or in combination, disclose the combination of features as recited by claim 1. Accordingly, the rejection of claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) based on the combination of Chou and Yamamoto is overcome and withdrawal thereof is respectfully requested.

The Examiner has rejected claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Chou in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,545,732 to Nakano (hereinafter “Nakano”). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1, from which claim 6 depends, is discussed above. Chou is discussed above relative to claim 1.

Nakano is relied on to allegedly teach rubber mounts for holding lamps. Nakano does not remedy the underlying deficiencies of Chou relative to claim 1. Thus, neither Chou nor Nakano, taken alone or in combination, disclose the combination of features as recited by claim 1. Accordingly, the rejection of claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) based on the combination of Chou and Nakano is overcome and withdrawal thereof is respectfully requested.

The Examiner has rejected claims 16 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly

unpatentable over Chou in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,150,557, to Chen (hereinafter "Chen"). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 15, from which claims 16 and 17 depend, is discussed above. Chou is discussed above relative to claim 1.

Chen is relied on to allegedly teach light emitting structures placed between a first and second optical panel. Chen does not remedy the underlying deficiencies of Chou relative to claim 15. Thus, neither Chou nor Chen, taken alone or in combination, disclose the combination of features as recited by claim 15. Accordingly, the rejection of claims 16 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) based on the combination of Chou and Chen is overcome and withdrawal thereof is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is firmly believed that the subject application is in condition for allowance, which action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Paul J. Esatto, Jr.  
Registration No. 30,749

SCULLY, SCOTT, MURPHY & PRESSER, P.C.  
400 Garden City Plaza – Suite 300  
Garden City, New York 11530  
(516) 742-4343 (telephone)  
(516) 742-4366 (facsimile)

PJE/HC